

**To:** Keteles, Kristen[Keteles.Kristen@epa.gov]  
**From:** Parker, Robert  
**Sent:** Thur 4/4/2013 3:32:39 PM  
**Subject:** Additional Soil Screening Data  
[Final Draft Investigation Report WE Lloyd #1 2-2-12 REV.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report TP 31X-3 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report BF 4-8 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report PF 14-12 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report PF 31-9 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report TP 12-13 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report TP 21-9.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report TP 22-12 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[Final Draft Investigation Report TP 42x-12 2-2-12.pdf](#)  
[2012 10 01 WE Lloyd 1 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 12-13 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 14-12 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 21-9 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 22-12 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 31-9 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 31X-3 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 42x-12 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)  
[2012 10 01 Blankenship 4-8 RSL Comparison.xlsx](#)

Hi Kristen,

I'm following up from our meeting on Tuesday with the soil data collected as part of the Pavillion Pits workgroup. Here's some background on the data that I've included in this email.

The Pavillion Pits workgroup was established to determine if pits in the Pavillion field are impacting groundwater. As part of that work, EPA, Encana, WOGCC, WDEQ, and the Wind River Environmental Quality Commission (WREQC), collected data at a handful of pit sites (most were what I'll call exploratory sites – where a pit was alleged, but we didn't have any data on it, so we investigated). This analysis was broader than what OGCC regularly requires. Some of the pit sites did have limited groundwater samples taken as well.

I took an initial look at the data last fall and tried to compare the results to the RSLs. So I've already copied and pasted the data into Excel format. Hopefully that helps. I will admit that my labeling isn't thorough; Column B in the Excel tables are the detected concentrations and Column C are the Detection Limits.

It should be noted that these pits are only a subset of pits in the field. In addition to this

investigation as part of the workgroup, Encana investigated some 30+ pits and closed under OGCC rules in the mid 2000s. These pits do have “closure reports” but generally only have DRO/GRO as their target decision analyte, so there’s not a lot of detail. Let me know if you’re interested in those reports.

Initially, three of those pits investigated (but not closed) during the mid 2000s investigation were enrolled in WDEQ’s Voluntary Remediation Program. Those pits have more detailed groundwater sampling reports. Through the investigation as part of the workgroup (which this data is from), the Blankenship Fee 4-8 pit was determined to have contaminated groundwater and was enrolled into the VRP. Those files are labeled as BF 4-8 or Blankenship 4-8.

Let me know if you have any other questions or concerns,

Thanks,

Rob

Rob Parker

Site Assessment Manager

Environmental Engineer

US EPA, Region 8, Denver

(303) 312-6664